Remarks

A. Claims in the Case

Claims 1-44 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 14, 17, 28, and 30 have been amended. Claims 42-44 are new.

B. The Claims Are Not Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-41 were rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,859,971 to Bittinger et al. (hereinafter "Bittinger") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,233,589 to Balcha et al. (hereinafter "Balcha") under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections.

To establish a *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974), MPEP § 2143.03. The cited art does not appear to teach or suggest all of the features of the rejected claims.

Bittinger appears to be cited for showing "dividing the original form of the original version of the input data stream into [one or more] separate original version output data streams through the use of a pre-processor" and "dividing the original form of the updated version of the input data stream into [one or more] separate updated version output data streams through the use of the pre-processor". The Examiner cites col. 27, lines 44-64 for support that Bittinger teaches the above-quoted features of claims 1, 14, and 28. The selected section of Bittinger refers to multiplexing and demultiplexing data streams. Multiplexing is related to a system of transmitting several messages or signals simultaneously on the same circuit or channel. Demultiplexing is related to separating several combined messages or signals of a multiplexed message or signal. The multiplexing/demultiplexing of Bittinger appears related to communication, and does not divide an input data stream (or updated version of the input data stream) into separated output data streams (or updated version output data streams) that are to be

used for differencing. The combination of Bittinger and Balcha does not teach or suggest all of the features of the rejected claims.

The combination of Bittinger and Balcha does not appear to teach or suggest at least the feature of claims 1, 14, and 28 of "differencing each of the separate updated version output data streams with a corresponding original version output data stream to produce data difference representations." Bittinger appears to teach or suggest differencing an input data stream with an updated input data stream. Balcha also appears to teach or suggest differencing an input data stream with an updated input data stream. Applicant requests removal of the obviousness rejection of claims 1, 14, 28 and the claims dependent thereon.

C.   Many Of The Dependent Claims Are Separately Patentable

Many of the dependent claims are believed to be independently patentable. For example, claims 6, 20 and 33 each recite in part: "wherein the dividing steps separate volatile components of the input data stream from less volatile components of the input data stream." Applicant submits that this feature, in combination with the features of the independent claims, does not appear to be taught or suggested by the cited art.   The Examiner cites Bittinger at col. 10, lines 39-59 for this teaching, however, Bittinger appears to teach calculating a CRC for an HTTP data stream. Bittinger does not appear to address "the dividing steps separate volatile components... from less volatile components..."

D.   New Claims

Applicant respectfully asserts new claims 42-44 are also allowable. The cited art does not appear to disclose, teach, or suggest "wherein dividing the original form of the updated version of the input data stream into one or more separate updated version output data streams includes parsing the input data stream according to a data type of the input data stream" as recited in claims 42-44. Support for the new claims is found in the specification at least on page 13 in the section entitled "Pre-processor example #1: Database record parsing:".

E. Additional Comments

Based on the above, Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

If an extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. A fee authorization is enclosed for the excess claims. If any fees are omitted, please appropriately charge those fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5543-00301/EBM.

Respectfully submitted,

David W. Quimby
Reg. No. 39,338

Attorney for Applicant

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
(512) 853-8800 (voice)
(512) 853-8801 (facsimile)

Date: Sept 16, 2004